world. I mean, if you take that view, this would be a natural way to describe that. But, if you take it as the future, then that is not what it is describing. but it is describing what happens then. Now, I notice that Young ends his description of this part with the words on p.156, "The eternity of the kingdom is stressed both in a positive and a negative fashion. / Attention should be called to the great commission, All power is give unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Sonk, and of the Holy Ghost. When our Lord uttered these words there can be no xx doubt that he had in mind this passage in Daniel... " Do you think that follows? "There can be doubt that He had in mind this passage in Daniel. Herein is but further evidence that He regarded Himself as one with the supernatural figure in the vision. And therefore placed the imprimatur of His approval upon the Messianic interpretation of the passage. Well, we agree with that xkxx thoroughly, that He did, but is win He saysing that when He gave the great commission that was carrying out this statement that to Him was given dominion, Honor, and sovereignty, with all peoples serving Him, His dominion is an everlasting dominion? Does it fit with that? If it does, why it is quite a jump from the ferse before, which is hereafter, ye shall see khakak this happen. Of course, Young is mostly devoting himself to denying the critical, and showing that it is wrong. But he doesn't make clear at times whether he is taking it of the first or second coming, but in general this passage he does refer to the 2nd coming, and you have to because Jesus says that hereafter this is going to happen. Yes?AAM: There are those who take it that way, but I don't think that would necessarily mean that they take ch.7 that way. Because in ch.7 you have the statement, Hereafter ... which ties it up to the farms future, ch.7. I don't think they would quite take ch.7 that way. Young doesn't make it very clear how he takes it. But the implication xx is that it is the future, rather than the past, but on ch.2 he is very strict. Student:.... AAM: No, no, it is a different figure altogether. I wouldn't think it would fit. It would show the people who take the verse in Luke as meaning the gradual spread of the gospel, might similarly believe that when the stone becomes a great mountain